



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,338	10/03/2000	L. David Chambers	ASTR-0003	4820
27964 7590 HITT GAINES P.C. P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			EXAMINER ELALLAM, AHMED	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/29/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/678,338	Applicant(s) CHAMBERS, L. DAVID
	Examiner AHMED ELALLAM	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.

 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.

 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.

 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

 a) All b) Some * c) None of:

 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	---

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to Amendment filed on 10/16/2006.

Claims 1-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 21, 23, 25-29, 31, 33, 35-38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andrews et al, US (5,878,130).

Hereinafter referred to as Andrews.

Regarding claims 1 and 11, with reference to figures 1 and 12, Andrews discloses a distributed switching platform and a method for operating the distributed switching platform, couplable to public network including a TCP/IP network, see column 5, lines 20-27 (claimed an Internet Protocol (IP) network), comprising:

A primary central controller PCC (30) couplable to the IP network, and configured to generate control signals for controlling distribution of calls, see column 4, lines 55-67; (claimed main control unit (MCU) couplable to the IP network and configured to generate call and control processing commands);

A call service center 501 (figure 12) coupled through the WAN interface 472, (claimed switching partition couplable to the IP network) comprising:

Status/control process 504 in combination with inbound telephone network interface 68 and outbound telephone network interface 68', (claimed input output distributor (IOD)), wherein status/control process 504 transmits control signals to the telephony interface 68, 68' and to switching matrix 506 for providing a request service to or from callers 18 and or 20 (claimed access nodes), see column 14, lines 5-29.

(Claimed an input-output distributor (IOD) configured to receive call and control processing commands in a packet based protocol), and a circuit-switched matrix and line interface coupled to the IOD and configured to provide a "*sole interface*" to a plurality of access nodes, the IOD configured to convey the call and call processing commands to the circuit-switched matrix and line interface to allow, based thereon, the circuit switched matrix and line interface, to control access to the plurality of access nodes as in claim 1, and generating a call and control processing commands with a main control unit coupled to IP network; coupling an input-output distributor (IOD) to the IP network; providing a "*sole interface*" interface to a plurality of access nodes via a circuit-switched matrix and line interface coupled to the IOD, the IOD receiving the call and control processing commands in a packet based protocol and conveying the call and processing commands to the circuit-switched matrix and line interface to allow, based thereon, the circuit-switched matrix and line interface to control access to the plurality of access nodes, as indicated in independent claim 11).

Further, with regard to figure 12, Andrews shows a connection traversing the call center through the switch fabric, the connection is between a caller and the primary central controller. (Claimed each connection between said access nodes and said MCU traverses said circuit switched matrix and said interface).

Examiner interpreted the call center 501 to be the claimed "sole interface".

Regarding claim 21, with reference to figures 1 and 12, Andrews discloses a distributed switching platform means coupled to public network including a TCP/IP network, see column 5, lines 20-27 (claimed an Internet Protocol (IP) network), comprising:

A primary central controller PCC (30) couplable to the IP network, and configured to generate control signals for controlling distribution of calls, see column 4, lines 55-67; (claimed main control unit (MCU means) couplable to the IP network and configured to generate call and control processing commands);

A call service center 501 means (figure 12) coupled through the WAN interface means 472, (claimed switching partition means couplable to the IP network) comprising:

Status/control process means 504 in combination with inbound telephone network interface means 68 and outbound telephone network interface means 68', (claimed input output distributor means (IOD)), wherein status/control process 504 means transmits control signals to the telephony interface means 68, 68' and to switching matrix means 506 for providing a request service to or from callers means 18 and or 20 (claimed access nodes), see column 14, lines 5-29. (Claimed an input-output

distributor (IOD) means configured to receive call and control processing commands in a packet based protocol, circuit-switched matrix and line interface means coupled to the IOD means and configured to provide a sole interface to a plurality of access nodes and MCU means, the IOD means configured to convey the call and call processing commands to the circuit-switched matrix and line interface to allow, based thereon, the circuit switched matrix and line interface, to control access to the plurality of access nodes).

Examiner interpreted the call center 501 to be the claimed "sole interface".

Further, with regard to figure 12, Andrews shows a connection traversing the call center through the switch fabric, the connection is between a caller and the primary central controller. (Claimed each connection between said access nodes and said MCU traverses said circuit switched matrix and said interface).

Regarding claim 31, with reference to figures 1, 5 and 12, Andrews discloses a distributed call service center (claimed enterprise call center) couplable to public network including a TCP/IP network, see column 5, lines 20-27 (claimed an Internet Protocol (IP) network), comprising:

A primary central controller PCC (30A') (primary control center 30A, as in figure 5) couplable to the IP network, and configured to generate control signals for controlling distribution of calls, see column 4, lines 55-67; (claimed primary main control unit (MCU) A Redundant central controller 30B' (Redundant central controller 30B as in figure 5), coupled to the IP network; wherein the primary and the redundant

controller are geographically separated, and wherein one of the controller can assume the control of system 200, see column 9, lines 22-39. (Claimed a primary main control unit (MCU) coupled to a first location associated with the IP network; a secondary MCU coupled to a second location associated with the IP network, at least one of the primary and secondary MCUs generating call and processing commands);

A call service center 501 (figure 12) coupled through the WAN interface 472, (claimed switching partition couplable to the IP network) comprising:

Status/control process 504 in combination with inbound telephone network interface 68 and outbound telephone network interface 68', (claimed input output distributor (IOD)), wherein status/control process 504 transmits control signals to the telephony interface 68, 68' and to switching matrix 506 for providing a request service to or from callers 18 and or 20 (claimed access nodes), see column 14, lines 5-29.

(Claimed an input-output distributor (IOD) configured to receive call and control processing commands in a packet based protocol, and a circuit-switched matrix and line interface coupled to the IOD and configured to provide a sole interface between a plurality of access nodes and said primary and secondary MCUs, the IOD configured to convey the call and call processing commands to the circuit-switched matrix and line interface to allow, based thereon, the circuit switched matrix and line interface, to control access to the plurality of access nodes).

Examiner interpreted the call center 501 to be the claimed "sole interface".

Further, with regard to figure 12, Andrews shows a connection traversing the call center through the switch fabric, the connection is between a caller and the primary

central controller. (Claimed each connection between said access nodes and said MCU traverses said circuit switched matrix and said interface).

Regarding claim 3, 13, and 23, with reference to figure 12, Andrews shows a WAN (Wide Area Interface) in connection between the central controller and the call service center 501 (claimed switching partition as in claim 3, and IOD as in claim 13, and switching partition means as in claim 23). (Claimed MCU (means) and the switching partition (means)/ IOD are geographically separable).

Regarding claim 5, 15 and 25, with reference to figure 9, Andrews shows Administrative means 32A (claimed application server) coupled to the central controller 30A'. (Claimed application server (means) couplable to and configured to communicate with the MCU).

Regarding claim 35, with reference to figure 9, Andrews shows Administrative means 32A (claimed application server) coupled to primary the central controller 30A'. (Claimed application server couplable to at least one of the primary and secondary MCUs).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 26, with reference to figure 9, Andrews shows a secondary central controller 30B' coupled to Internet 408. (Claimed MCU (means as in claim 26)) is a primary MCU and the distributed switching platform (means as in claim 26) further comprising a secondary MCU couplable to the IP network).

Regarding claims 8, 18, 28 and 36, with reference to figure 9, Andrews discloses a primary and a redundant central controllers 32A and 32B' respectively. Further, Andrews discloses a "hot-standby approach" in which a redundant controller is idle

while the primary controller control the system. See column 9, lines 32-35. (Claimed only one primary and secondary MCUs provides the call and call processing commands at anytime, the one of the primary and secondary MCUs being in control of the enterprise call center).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27, with reference to figure 5, Andrews discloses that the primary central controller and the redundant central controller are geographically separated. See column 9, lines 7-9.

Regarding claims 9, 19 and 29, Andrews discloses the hot-standby approach in which a redundant controller is idle while the primary controller control the system. See column 9, lines 32-35. Further, Andrew discloses updating and or changing the system configuration data stored in the central controller database by the central controller. See column 7, lines 24-29.

Regarding claim 33, with reference to figure 12, Andrews shows the call center 501 is coupled to the primary and the standby controllers through a WAN interface. (Claimed first switching partition is coupled to a third location associated with the IP network)

Regarding claim 37, with reference to figure 9, Andrews discloses a primary and a redundant central controllers 32A and 32B' respectively. Further, Andrews discloses a "hot-standby approach" in which a redundant controller is idle while the primary controller control the system. See column 9, lines 32-39. (Examiner interpreted the Claimed only one primary and secondary MCUs provides the call and call processing

commands at anytime, the one of the primary and secondary MCUs being in control of the enterprise call center).

Andrews discloses the hot-standby approach in which a redundant controller is idle while the primary controller control the system. See column 9, lines 32-35. Further, Andrew discloses updating and or changing the system configuration data stored in the central controller database by the central controller. See column 7, lines 24-29.

Regarding claim 37, with reference to figure 9, Andrews discloses a primary and a redundant central controllers 32A and 32B' respectively. Further, Andrews discloses a "hot-standby approach" in which a redundant controller is idle while the primary controller control the system. See column 9, lines 32-39. In addition, Andrew discloses updating and or changing the system configuration data stored in the central controller database by the central controller. See column 7, lines 24-29. (Claimed one of primary and secondary MCUs which is in control of the enterprise call center updates a database associated with the other one of the primary and secondary MCUs).

Regarding claim 38, Andrews discloses that caller are connected through an SS7 based network. See column 5, lines 21-27. (Claimed enterprise call center is coupled to PSTN via one of the access nodes).

Regarding claim 40, Andrews discloses that the functional components can be embodied as one or more computer program processes running on one or more general purpose computers. See column 15, lines 17-47. (Claimed wherein the enterprise call center of claim 31, at least one of the primary and secondary MCUs and switching

partition are embodied in a sequence of instructions executable on a general purpose computer).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 10, 12, 20, 22, 30, 32 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews in view of Darland et al, US 2003/0128698.

Hereinafter referred to as Darland.

Regarding claims 2, 12, 22, and 32, Andrews discloses all the limitation of respective parent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 as discussed above.

The difference between Andrews' teaching and claims 2, 12, 22, 32 is that Andrews whiles discloses using a TCP/IP protocols for communicating between the controller unit and the "switching partition" as discussed above (see also figure 10 for internet interface to the controller 472), it doesn't specify using a user datagram Protocol for communicating between the controller and the switching partition.

However, Darland discloses using UDP/IP protocol for communicating between a switch controller and ISN component (call center). See paragraph [0042]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use the UDP/IP protocol for communicating between the controllers of Andrews and

the call service center 501 (figure 12) (claimed switching partition) using the UDP/IP communicating method of Darland so that fast exchange of control signals can be provided by eliminating the TCP signaling bandwidth consumption due to signaling feature implied by using the TCP/IP standard. It is also advantageous to use the UDP/IP protocol in case of voice calling services using the Internet.

Regarding claims 10, 20, 30, and 39, as discussed above with reference to the parent respective base claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, Andrews discloses service center (claimed switching partition comprising an IOD and a circuit-switched matrix and line interface that provides an interface to the plurality of access node). Andrews does not disclose a second service center, (claimed second switching partition comprising a second IOD and a second circuit-switched matrix and line interface coupled to the second IOD that provides an interface to additional access node).

However, with reference to figures 1 and 15 Darland discloses a call center 108a connected to a call center 12b (Intelligent Services networks INS#1 and INS#2) through a WAN (Wide Area Network) connection. See paragraph [0207].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have other service centers similar to service center 501 (figure 12) of Andrews interconnected using the WAN interface 472 (Figure 12) as taught by Darland so to provide the calling services to subscribers belonging to the other call centers. A skilled person would recognize the desirability to create other call center to accommodate an increasing number of calling services requests.

3. Claims 4, 14, 24 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews in view of Sonesh et al, US (6,614,783). Hereinafter referred to as Sonesh.

Regarding claims 4, 14, 24 and 34, Andrews discloses access node of being access nodes belonging to a variety of networks, comprising SS7 and TCP/IP based networks among others, see column 4, lines 55-64 and column 5, lines 21-27,

However, Andrews does not specify that the access nodes are selected from a group consisting of a digital instrument, analogue instrument, analog trunk and digital trunk.

However, with reference to figure 1, Sonesh shows in the same field of endeavor of calling centers, a telephone 104 communicating over the PSTN 111, wherein the link between the telephone and the PSTN may be an analogue trunk or digital trunk. See column 7, lines 62-65. (Claimed digital instrument, analogue instrument, analog trunk and digital trunk).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have the access node of Andrews being those of Sonesh. A person of skill in the art would do so by recognizing the benefit of providing a variety of calling services to a mix of subscribers to POT (Plain Old Telephony) services and internet telephony services regardless of the geographical location of the subscribers (Andrews, column 5, lines 19-27). The benefit would be the ability to generate more revenues by the provisioning of calling services by Andrews's system to the variety of

networks regardless of the type of access nodes in use by the variety the networks (Andrews, column 5, lines 19-27).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 11 that "*Andrews does not teach a circuit-switched matrix and line interface configured to provide a sole interface between a plurality of access nodes and a main control unit (MCU) wherein each connection between the access nodes and the MCU traverses the circuit-switched matrix and line interface as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31*". Emphasis added.

Applicant further argues on page 12 that "*The call service center 501, however, does not provide the sole interface between the central controller 30A, 30B, and the callers 18, 20. More specifically, each connection between the central controller 30A, 30B, and the callers 18, 20, does not traverse through the call service center 501. On the contrary, as evident from Figure 12, there are multiple paths between the central controller 30A, 30B, and the callers 18 and 20. One path between the central controller 30A, 30B, and callers 18 and 20 does traverse through the call service center 501. But there is also a path directly between the central controller 30A, 30B, and the public network 1 to the callers 18 and 20 which does not traverse call service center 501. As*

such, the call service center 501 is not the sole interface between the central controller 30A, 30B, and the callers 18, 20." Emphasis added.

As to the limitation of sole interface, Examiner respectfully disagrees, Examiner reiterates the argument presented in the last office action with regard to the "sole interface"; in which argument Examiner had stated, that "*the call service center 501 (figure 12) coupled through the WAN interface 472 and comprising Status/control process 504 in combination with inbound telephone network interface 68 and outbound telephone network interface 68' to represent a "sole interface" between the main control unit and subscribers. The reason for this analogy between the call service center and the claimed sole interface is based on similar functionalities provided by the call service center to those claimed, and in addition to the fact that the sole interface as understood from the specification to mean an interface implicitly having "other interfaces" because such sole interface to access nodes cant be that simple when the access nodes are selected from a group of "digital or analogue instruments, such as digital or analogue telephony devices, trunks (digital or analogue) or any telephony resource (e.g., a conference bridge)", as understood from the specification, (see page 12, lines 17-20). In another word the claimed sole interface must have plurality of interfaces (and other circuitry) necessary to communicate with each specific one of the "access nodes" since a specific interface is required for each different access node. Stated differently, Applicant's representation of a sole interface as a *box* (, i.e. circuit switch matrix and line interface unit 140, figure 1) and lack of detailed structures such as those presented by Andrews doesn't represent a logical background for non-anticipation by Andrews".*

Emphasis added. In addition to the above, Andrews discloses that “**networks 12, 14 may comprise the same physical network in this embodiment 500**”, see column 14, lines 36-39. Therefore, the call site 501 (excluding agent stations 482’) represent a “sole interface” between the controller(s) of Andrews and the access nodes represented by caller 1, 2 and agent stations 482’.

As to the argument with regard to the added limitation “*each connection between the access nodes and the MCU traverses the circuit-switched matrix and line interface*”.

Applicant pointed to the specification (page 12, line 21, to page 13, line 17, and Figures 1-3) for support of the added limitation. However, the passage relied upon doesn’t specify any connection(s) between the access nodes and the MCU traversing the circuit-switched matrix and line interface nor gives any specifics with regard to such connection(s). Nevertheless, and contrary to applicants assertions, with regard to figure 12, Andrews shows callers 1 and 2 in connection with interface 68, which is connected to central controller(s) through the switching matrix 506, status/control process 504 and the WAN interface, and that reads on the claimed “*each connection between said access nodes and said MCU traverses said circuit switched matrix and said interface*”.

Rejection of Claims 2, 10, 12, 20, 22, 30, 32, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Applicant argues that Andrews doesn’t anticipate the limitations of independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, and therefore the cited combination of Andrews and Darland, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Examiner respectfully disagrees, since Andrews discloses the invention of independent claims as indicated above,

Darland is maintained to disclose the deficiencies of Andrews, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness is believed to be proper as indicated in the rejections above.

Rejection of Claims 4, 14, 24, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Applicant argues that Andrews doesn't anticipate the limitations of independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, and therefore the cited combination of Andrews and Sonesh, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Examiner respectfully disagrees, since Andrews discloses the invention of independent claims as indicated above, Sonesh is maintained to disclose the deficiencies of Andrews, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness is believed to be proper as indicated in the rejections above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ELALLAM whose telephone number is (571) 272-3097. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, To Doris can be reached on (571) 272-7629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AHMED ELALLAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2616
12/14/06


DORIS H. TO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600